

St. Martins School of Art, Sculpture Department.
The "A" Course, 1969-1973.

In the school year 1969-70, the first year of the degree course in sculpture at the St. Martins School in London was designed, prepared and presented by Peter Atkins, Garth Evans, Peter Harvey and Gareth Jones. In the following school year the same members of staff re-presented their first year course to the new group of first year students. These members of staff then worked with the students whose first year they had directed until both groups graduated, the first group in 1972 and the second group in 1973.

The degree course leads to a BA in Fine Art. It is normally a three year course specializing in a particular design subject or in painting or sculpture. Students undertaking such a course are required to have obtained certain academic qualifications, to have studied for at least one year in an Art College and to have reached an age of not less than eighteen.

It is the intention of this paper to outline the unique programme of work invented by the four members of staff named above. This programme became known as the "A" Course and the staff responsible for it referred to as the Group "A" Staff. These terms will be used here. In fact two Courses were presented, one to students who entered the School in September 1969 and graduated in June 1972 and the other to students entering the School a year later and graduating in June 1973. However, the difference between these Courses is insignificant, at least, in comparison with the difference between them and the situations normally confronted in Schools of Art. Reference will only be made to the distinctions between the Courses here and there; generally they will be described as a single Course.

It is not the intention of this brief account to enter into a disclosure of the rationale for the "A" Course or to describe the context in which it occurred. Neither is it intended to describe or evaluate the student's work. It is to be understood that the Group "A" Staff co-ordinated their conduct in relation to the students to the point where, in terms of managing the projects, they were interchangeable. This account therefore will not refer to the individuals concerned. The four members of staff met regularly and they consistently communicated by telephone and written notes throughout the period of the Course. There were usually only one or two members of the Group present in the School on any one day.

The Course consisted in what the Staff referred to as Projects. In the first year of the Course these Projects accounted for most of the time, from 10 a.m. until 4.30 p.m. five days per week, which the students were obliged to spend in the School. In the second and third years of the Course Projects probably accounted for less than a third of the students' time. It was a characteristic of the Course that the Staff did not engage with the students in any way, outside of the Project situations. The Projects were always designed in advance, in great detail and the conditions, "rules," constraints, obligations or procedures which they consisted of were agreed upon and written down. They were not susceptible to modifications, either as a result of the activities of the students within them or of the doubts and anxieties which the Staff may have experienced during some of them.

The average duration of a first year Project was six weeks. The School year was divided into three terms with some twelve or more weeks per term. We therefore had a basic structure of two Projects per term although, in fact, some Projects were of less than half a term's duration while others were incomplete at the end of a term. The students were unable, always, to predict the duration of a Project.

The pattern of the first year in 1969-70 was not precisely repeated in 1970-71. One Project, known as the Individual Specifications Project, was not repeated and most of the Projects were re-thought and changed in some measure. In 1970-71 the Individual Specifications Project was replaced by a Project known as the Combinations of Materials Project. The other Projects in the first year were referred to as the Materials Project, Sitting Periods Project, Notice Board Project, Glove Project and parts one and two of the Discussion of Work Project. Three of these Projects will be described.

The Materials Project was the first Project given. It began on the first day of the school year. The students were formally welcomed to the School. They were each handed a badge bearing their name and instructed that this was to be worn during the working hours. The staff also wore name badges. The following statement was then read, "You are starting your Course here in a situation which we have planned. We have planned this situation very carefully and in great detail. This planned situation we will call the Project. The area beyond this partition is the Project Area. The success of this Project is dependent upon the extent to which everyone of us is able to sustain the required degree of self discipline. We anticipate that this will be an extremely demanding task. This Project is the most effective introduction to your chosen area of study which we are able to provide at the present time. We will now begin the Project." The door to the Project Area was then unlocked. The Staff entered inviting the students to follow them. As they came through the door each student was handed a piece of material, a 2ft cube of polystyrene wrapped in brown paper.

The Project Area was a section of a very large studio which had been partitioned off to allow approximately the square footage per student allocated by the School. The Area had been completely cleared and painted white. It contained only the material handed to the students as they entered and a series of notices. The notices, in large black letters on white card read as follows: "Attendance for this Project is compulsory. Punctuality is essential. The working hours are from 10 a.m. to 11.00 a.m., 11.30 a.m. to 1.00 p.m., 2.00 p.m. to 3.00 p.m., 3.30 p.m. to 4.30 p.m. The Area is to be vacated and will be locked during the breaks and at 4.30 p.m. No verbal communication is allowed, except between an individual student and the member of Staff. No writing or drawing instruments are allowed." Once all the students had entered, the door to the Area was bolted on the inside. No further general information and no instructions were given.

The member of Staff present announced the time at the coffee break in the morning, at lunch time, the tea break in the afternoon and at 4.30 p.m. He then unbolted the door, waited for all the students to leave and locked the door on the outside. The students were otherwise not permitted to leave the area without the member of Staff asking them their purpose. They were permitted to obtain

whatever tools they required. They were not permitted to bring any additional material into the Area nor were they allowed to remove any of the material they had been given. The students were not allowed to take photographs in the Area, they were not allowed to read, eat (apart from confectionary etc.) or to sleep. Students who were absent for more than two days were written to at their place of residence.

After a predetermined number of days and in the absence of the students the polystyrene was completely cleared from the Area. When the students re-entered they were each handed another piece of material a roll of heavy brown paper containing some fifty square yards. After another predetermined period and in the same manner the paper was replaced with a large ball of thick string and then, similarly, the string was replaced with a sack of plaster. After several days and without removing the plaster a polythene bag of water was given to each student. Finally, with the Area completely cleared again each student was handed a stop watch and, in this instance, told the duration of time he was being given it for. When this Project was re-presented the following year a different set of materials was used, different periods of time were involved and, for reasons of cost, the stop watches were omitted.

It is now necessary to describe the conduct of the Staff. Their general conduct in this initial Project was maintained throughout the entire Course. (One Project, the Mask Project, in the third year is an exception.)

The Staff adopted a formal manner. During the first year Projects they spoke to the students only in order to maintain the conditions of the Project and to answer questions. They did not engage in discussions with the students. They attempted to answer all questions by articulating the evident facts. They avoided making generalised or speculative statements. They spoke sharply to any student attempting to circumvent the conditions of the project. Technical information was given in so far as it was specifically sought by the students but the Staff did not intervene in the activity of any student operating within the conditions of the Project (except in so far as safety requirements demanded.)

Students who were late were simply told that they were late, no explanation was sought or considered. Students who were persistently late were informed, by letter, that this was jeopardising their position on the Course. Students who were absent were given the same information and reminded of the School's requirement that an absence of three days or more, in cases of ill health, necessitated a doctor's certification. Students who persistently attempted to circumvent the conditions of the Project were asked to leave the Project Area, they were then only readmitted if they agreed to accept the prevailing conditions. The alternative open to the students, after consultation, if they so wished, with the Head of Department, was to seek admission to another College. No attempt was made to explain or to justify the conditions of the Project to the students.

The Staff avoided revealing any response to the activity or the works of the students. They behaved as though their responsibility was exclusively with the maintenance of the conditions of the Project. They observed the students at work and were seen to be doing so but they were careful not to allow their interest or lack of interest in

particular works to be apparent. They were concerned to avoid any expression of feeling or any articulation of opinion in regard to the students legitimate activities. If the member of Staff was in doubt about the legitimacy of an activity, say, in the Materials Project, the case of a student using matches where it was not immediately clear whether they were functioning as tools or as additional material, he would pay special attention to the activity and, perhaps consult another member of Staff to determine the matter. They did not act hastily on such matters. If an issue arose which had not been agreed between them in advance they consulted each other and, if the matter resulted from a student's question, he would be told that his question would be answered as soon as there had been an opportunity for consultation.

The Staff then, during the first year, were essentially in a passive role except in regard to the conditions of the Project. Their demeanour was calm and serious, it was not officious but it was firm and, when necessary, forceful. Outside of the Project they behaved straightforwardly towards the students although they avoided establishing particular friendships. They made no reference to nor responded to any comment on the Course.

A letter, initiated and written by the Group "A" Staff and signed by the Head of Department, had been issued to all other members of the Faculty at the beginning of the Materials Project. This read as follows:

"A five week Project has been designed for the first year sculpture students. It is concerned with attempting to channel as much energy and attention into a relationship with a sequence of simple materials as possible. The method adopted has something of the nature of a serious game with conventions and rules which we hope to get the students to agree to work. It is important that the tendency to release the energy from possible frustrations outside the Project is not encouraged. We would like to ask that members of staff do not allow themselves to be drawn into discussions concerning the Project. Any member of staff wishing to have more information should contact Garth Evans or Gareth Jones."

The stop watches in the last phase of the Materials Project were collected by the member of Staff present at the end of each work period. At the end of the Project the students were handed a letter stating that there would be no further specific Course requirements until the beginning of the next Project. The time and date of the beginning of the next Project was given and the students instructed that they were required to be present in the Project Area at this given time. On the first occasion there was an interval of some three weeks between the termination of the Materials Project and the commencement of the next Project. The following year this interval was cut to one week. The second Project was the Individual Specifications Project and, as has already been noted this was replaced, the following year, by the Combinations of Materials Project.

The next Project to be described was presented, to both groups of first year students, in the second term of the respective years. It was referred to as the Sitting Periods Project. Again, the Project began with the Project Area having been completely cleared, with the exception of a notice and, on this occasion, some chairs. A number of identical chairs had been placed in a circle to one side of the Area. On the back of each chair was the name of one of the students.

There was one additional chair, set slightly apart from the circle, for the member of Staff. The Project was introduced by the following letter, a copy of which was handed to each student.

"In the Project we are about to begin you may make anything you wish. Your work must be confined to the Project Area. For the production of specific components limited use may be made of equipment fixed elsewhere in the School. There will be periods during which you withdraw from the physical making activity. In these periods you will be required to sit in the chair which bears your name. These periods of sitting will be co-ordinated and you will be informed of the times by means of the notices. Talking will be allowed only during the periods of sitting."

The notice which had been prepared for this Project stated at what time the next period of sitting would begin and at what time it would end. The actual times were chosen by the member of Staff present and displayed by means of printed cards attached to the notice. At the end of each sitting period, the times of the next sitting period were posted. At the end of the last period of the day, times for the first period on the next day would be displayed. The number of sitting periods in any one day and the distribution of them during the day varied but the total amount of time involved was maintained, roughly, at one third of the total time which the students were expected to spend in the School. (It will be noted later that this changed in the second phase of the Project.) The notice also stated that no specific physical activities, other than talking, would be allowed during the period of sitting.

The door to the Project Area was left open during this Project except in the periods of sitting. Two minutes after the commencement of a period of sitting the member of Staff would bolt the door. Students arriving after the door had been bolted were not admitted and were marked absent from that period. A register of attendance at the sitting periods, and only at the sitting periods, was maintained. Students with a sufficiently poor record of attendance were written to in the same manner as in the first Project. The responsibilities of the Staff in this Project, outside of the sitting periods, were to ensure that there was no talking in the Project Area.

During the sitting periods the member of Staff had to ensure that the students did not engage in specific physical activities, other than talking. Smoking and eating confectionary were allowed. Reading and writing were not, (reading aloud was sometimes permitted at the discretion of the Staff.) The Staff would locate themselves, during the sitting periods, in a position which clearly excluded them from the circle of chairs but which allowed them to hear what was said by the students. If the students chose to speak particularly quietly however, it was possible for their communication to be unintelligible to the member of Staff. The Staff did not initiate or engage in the students' discussions. Their general conduct was that which has already been described.

After a period of five weeks the second phase of this project was initiated. A copy of the following letter was handed to each student two days in advance of the changes,

"The present arrangements for this Project will be modified from Thursday 25th February. At intervals the location of the chairs will be altered by the member of Staff and you will be informed of the exceptions to the requirements of the sitting periods by means of the notice."

arrangement of the chairs was altered by the member of Staff, so that they surrounded or confronted the working area of a particular student. The student whose working area was being focussed on would, generally, be exempt from the restrictions on his activity during the sitting periods concerned. The student who was exempted from restrictions and whose working area was being focussed on was referred to as the subject of those sitting periods. The re-location and arrangement of the chairs and the selection of the subject, or occasionally, subjects, was at the discretion of the member of Staff. The Project was continued until each student had been the subject for a number of sitting periods equivalent, in total time, to a full working day. The total duration of this Project was eight weeks.

The third Project to be described was also presented to both groups of first year students. It was referred to as the Glove Project and was presented in the third term. The Project was introduced by letter, a copy of which was given to each student before they entered the Project Area. The letter virtually described the Project, it read as follows,

"A variety of materials and tools have been placed inside the Project Area. In this Project you may obtain whatever additional material and tools you require but you may not leave the Project Area during the established working hours. Additional material and tools must therefore be obtained overnight or during the normal breaks and brought into the Project Area at the beginning of a work period. A pedestal has been placed inside the Project Area near to the door. At the beginning of each work period the member of Staff will place a number of gloves on this pedestal. In this Project there will be a limit to the number of students who are allowed to work at any one time. The procedure, when you wish to work, will be to take a glove from the pedestal and wear it or attach it to your person where it will be visible, you may then use any of the materials and tools which have been placed in the Area. If there is no glove available you may not work. When you are not working you are to remain seated in one of the chairs provided and you must not then undertake any specific physical activity. When you wish to stop working you must return the glove to the pedestal and then sit down."

The notices displayed in the Project Area on this occasion reinstated the conditions prevailing in the Materials Project and the procedure in regard to lateness and poor attendance was the same as in that Project. The number of gloves made available to the students for any particular work period was at the discretion of the member of Staff present. This number, of course, was always less than the total number of students. Frequently only one glove was made available.

A procedure existed for electing a student to work if, for a specified period of time, no student was working voluntarily. This involved drawing the name of one of the students at random from a bag

manipulation, or an evident change in the state of the material were the criteria by which the Staff determined whether or not a student was working in this Project. The duration of the Project was four weeks.

It will be appreciated that, as the Group "A" Staff were re-presenting the first year of their Course to a new intake of students during the school year 1970-71, the students who had completed this first year of the Course in the previous year were now in their second year and they were not, for this year, under the direction of the Group "A" Staff. At the end of that school year the Head of Department gave these students and the group which had just completed the first year of the Course, the choice of working through to graduation with the Group "A" Staff, or working under the direction of a different group of staff. In order to assist the students in making this choice the Head of Department required that the two groups of staff produce a statement about the programmes which they, respectively, intended to pursue. Group "A" Staff prepared and presented the following statement

- 1) The content of the "A" Course cannot be verbally prescribed.
 - 2) The "A" Course will not proceed from the conception that sculpture can result from a total dependence on historical precedent.
 - 3) The "A" Course will not disregard the actual academic roles of the participants.
 - 4) The "A" Course will not proceed from the Staff's evaluation of the student's achievements.
 - 5) The "A" Course will not proceed from an existing conception of the social role of the artist.
 - 6) The "A" Course will not proceed from the verbally articulated intentions of the students.
 - 7) The "A" Course will not proceed from the concept that individual identity is totally determined by a summary of past experience.
 - 8) The "A" Course will not proceed from the concept that the work and working methods of the Staff provide implicit models of quality.
 - 9) The "A" Course will not proceed under the illusion that its parameters are determined exclusively by the participants.
- On the basis of this statement and, presumably, their experience of the Staff during the first year, some 90% of the students committed themselves to the Course.

While the general conduct of the Staff remained essentially the same as it had been during the first year, the Projects presented during the second and third years were significantly more varied, both in character and duration. There was a total of twelve Projects presented by the Staff in these years. In addition, a number of Projects were designed and presented by the students themselves. The Projects presented by the Staff were referred to as the, Work by Staff Project, this was in three parts, the Instructions by Post Project, the Bus Journey, Employment Project, Student/Agent Project, Samples Project, Essential Equipment Project, Report Project, Area

Designated "A", Transformation Project, Recollection Project and the Mask Project. The basis of each of these projects will be indicated and three of them described in some detail. Generally they were presented to either second or third year students, but some involved, or were open to, both groups of students.

The Work by Staff Project was in fact three Projects which the Staff designed for themselves and engaged upon, in the studio, alongside the on-going work of the students. The constraints which constituted these Projects and governed the activities within them were determined by establishing the categories of constraint needing to be determined, producing a range of alternatives within each category and then obtaining a specific set of constraints by taking one from each category at random.

The Instructions by Post Project will be described in a little more detail. It was a Project of six weeks duration, presented to second year students (although eventually involving most third year students in some degree). It began at the start of the second term of the year. The Staff constructed a small "office" within the studio from which they operated, when in School, during this Project. However, this Project was not confined to the School building and the Staff's engagement in it was not restricted to the time they spent in School. There were no overall conditions in regard to the students work, or their conduct in the studio. The Staff did not concern themselves with observing the students' activity except in order to see if a particular instruction had been responded to.

The basis of the project was to send a wide range of material to the students through the post. The material was chosen by the members of Staff without any general attempt, on their part, to co-ordinate their selections or to relate the material to their own personal or professional interests. They also made no attempt to relate the material sent to a particular student to the known activities of that student. Indeed, if anything, the Staff were concerned that, in general, the students should not be able to attach an obvious significance or meaning to the material which they received. It was, for instance, considered an unfortunate coincidence by the Staff, that a student involved in a minor motor cycle accident received, the following day, a series of quotations from a manual on road safety.

The material which was sent to the students included instructions, clear and specific, or obscure, requiring something to be done, or not to be done, quotations from famous or obscure works, remarks, proverbs, directions, as to how to get to a particular place or how to do something, but without any instruction, and even without the possibility, sometimes, that the recipient was to act on them. The material was not confined to that which could be communicated verbally - maps, diagrams, reproductions of various kinds, and drawings etc. were included. Packages of physical material of various kinds were also sent. In fact anything which could reasonably be sent through the post.

Each member of Staff was allocated a number of students and he addressed himself exclusively to those students. At agreed intervals the students were re-allocated. No two students were ever sent the same items of material. All the material was signed, "Group "A"

Staff" and it was not readily apparent to the students which individual member of Staff was responsible for any particular item. The material was sent directly to the student's place of residence. The material was always addressed as coming from the address of the School but, if the item involved the student responding by post, he could be instructed to address his response to the place of residence of one of the Staff and, not necessarily that of the Staff member responsible for initiating the item. Some items of material required that a response be made, or sent, to another student and, through this procedure, the third year students were involved.

There was no means of compelling students to act in response to any item of material they received and no attempt was made to do so. However, when the Staff sent an item of material which was in the form of an instruction to the student, to do or to refrain from doing something, it was carefully formulated so that the students response, or lack of it, would be evident to the Staff and, also, so that it would be apparent to the student that this would be the case. The Staff made copies of all the material they sent. The copies were filed under the names of the students to whom the items were sent. A system of coding, involving coloured spots, indicated whether or not the original item had required a response and, if it had, whether or not the response had been received.

At the conclusion of the period set for this Project all the material involved was made available to the students by displaying it in the studio.

The Bus Journey was a one day Project. The Staff and second year students met early in the morning. Each had obtained a permit giving unlimited travel on London buses for the day. Each person, in turn, took it upon himself to decide which bus the group should board and when they should alight.

The Employment Project was proposed to the third year students at the beginning of their third year. They agreed to undertake the Project. It involved them obtaining paid employment for a period of four weeks, pooling their earnings and, collectively, deciding what to do with the resulting fund. The Staff negotiated their absence from the School for the relevant period.

The Student/Agent Project will be described more fully. It involved the second group of students and was presented to them during the first term of their third year. As usual it was introduced by letter, a copy of which was given to each student. The letter read as follows,

"It is intended to hold a series of tutorials. You have been appointed to act as the agent for another student and will be required to represent him at his tutorial. A student has been appointed to act as your agent and he is required to represent you at your tutorial. It is your responsibility to obtain evidence of study from the student you are representing, to present this evidence at the tutorial and to answer questions on behalf of the student for whom you are acting. The student you represent is required to be present at his tutorial as an observer. You are required to be present at your tutorial as an observer. There is to be no discussion and no instructions may be passed between the agent and the student he represents during the tutorial. The agent and only the agent may request an adjournment for consultation. Adjournments will be limited

and at the discretion of the Staff. The dates of tutorials and the appointed representatives are given on the enclosed timetable. All tutorials will begin at 10.00 a.m. on the date specified and continue, with the established breaks, until terminated by the Staff. There will be two members of Staff present at each tutorial. Other students may attend as observers at the discretion of the Staff. The tutorials will begin in the A4 studio office but may be transferred to other locations as instructed by the agent provided satisfactory arrangements have been made for this."

It has already been noted that, throughout the Course, the members of Staff carefully co-ordinated their conduct and that their role in each Project was predetermined. In the case of the Student/Agent Project, as with other Projects, a set of "rules" or guide-lines was prepared to enable the Staff to play their part consistently. The following are quotations from the "rules" used by the Staff in this Project. "The Staff will always address the agent and only the agent, other persons will be addressed only to maintain order." "The Staff will refer to the agent by name." "The student being represented will be referred to as the agent's client." "The Staff should not assume the initiative nor adopt an aggressive stance." "The Staff should expect to be shown evidence of study, they should examine this evidence, that is their only function." "The Staff may ask any questions they think relevant in order to elicit information about the client's studies as revealed by the evidence." "The Staff should not make comments on or pass opinions about the evidence of study though they may comment on the agent's behaviour." "In the event of no evidence of study being presented the Staff are to assume that this is the result of a poor performance on the part of the agent. In this case the tutorial may proceed, briefly and, at the Staff's discretion, in the absence of the client, in order to determine the origin of the agent's failure." "The Staff should refrain, as far as possible, from talking with one another during the tutorial." "The Staff should wait to be shown the evidence, they should not handle the evidence without the permission of the agent." "The tutorial will finish when the Staff, and only the Staff, so determine." "The Staff will formally thank the agent at the conclusion of the tutorial."

The Samples Project involved the students providing a sample of the material(s) they wished to use. The Staff then determined the quantity of such material allowed to the student. The student was then, on production of the specified quantity of the chosen material, allowed to work in a specially constructed Project Area which the Staff did not enter.

The Essential Equipment Project required the students to produce a display of the equipment which they considered had been essential to their work during a specified period of the Course.

The Report Project required the students to design and prepare a series of confrontations between their work and a party of persons, including Staff, of their choice. Forms were prepared and issued to the students to enable them to specify the essential features of these confrontations and to communicate their requirements to other persons involved.

The Area Designated "A" was a prescribed area of the large studio being used for the Course. The Project to which this referred

required that each participant in the Course, including the Staff, occupy this Area exclusively for a full working day. The Designated Area functioned somewhat in the manner of a stage or platform from which the participants attempted to reveal, disclose, or in some way indicate aspects of their interests, concerns and activities.

In the Transformation Project each student was given a sum of money, equal in value but different in form. They were required to record and evidence, to the Staff at prescribed intervals, the transformations of material state which resulted from their use of this money.

The Recollection Project involved the students in an undertaking to attempt, in a disciplined way, to recall the whole range of activities and concerns which had engaged them, both inside and outside School, at an earlier date on the Course and to make a presentation of the resulting material.

The Mask Project was presented to the third year students and, apart from a celebration which the Staff organized for the last day of the Course, was the final Project. The third year students were each invited to make use of a specially constructed Project Area for a full working day. They were given no instructions and no further information other than that the only people allowed to enter the Area while they were making use of it would be the Staff. The student concerned was at liberty to use the Area in any way he wished and to enter and leave it at will.

The Staff had prepared masks for this Project. The masks were in the form of bags made from plain material with pieces cut out for the eyes and mouth. When the Staff entered the Area, never less than two at a time, they placed these bags over their heads and then proceeded to adopt an attitude towards the student and towards whatever he was doing which was, in so far as they could achieve this, a complete and total contrast with their conduct throughout the preceding Course. They acted in a crude, vulgar and unsympathetic manner, shouting at the student and demanding that he "explain" and "justify" his behaviour. They hardly waited for and gave no intelligent or serious consideration to the students' replies. They articulated whatever critical, unkind and aggressive thoughts entered their heads, treating the students undertaking, though without giving it much attention, as if it were an offence. A stream of verbal abuse was directed at the particular undertaking and at the student himself, attacking his presumption in thinking that he was an artist and that his undertaking was related to art. This abuse was extended to artists and art in general. At other moments, the Staff, acting without any attempt to be consistent or logical, would assume an apparently more sympathetic pose and, making arbitrary and commonplace assumptions about the students intentions, they would maintain a flow of suggestions and advice as to how he should proceed. They would however eventually become angry and resume their abuse, attacking the student for ignoring their advice and failing to take up their suggestions. They would repeat endlessly the questions they asked, the comments they made and the opinions they expressed.

These verbal assaults on the students occurred at intervals throughout the day and lasted for periods of time ranging from about 15 minutes to 45 minutes. The students were able to bolt the door to the Area on the inside and were not therefore compelled to admit the Staff or, as has already been noted, to remain in the Area with them. On each occasion, prior to leaving the Area, the Staff removed their masks and formally thanked the student.